

Appl. No. : 09/910,477
Filed : July 20, 2001

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 15, 16, 26, and 27.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

None

Proposed Amendments

Discussed antecedent basis in Claim 15. Discussed proposed amendments as shown in this paper to Claims 26 and 27. Discussed cancellation of Claim 16 to overcome double patenting rejection.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

None

Results of Interview

Applicant to file a response.

Appl. No. : 09/910,477
Filed : July 20, 2001

REMARKS

In the December 28, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner objects to informalities in Claim 15; provisionally rejects Claim 16 under the judicially-created doctrine of double patenting; rejects Claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, but states that Claims 26 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections, rejects Claims 25 and 35 as being dependent upon rejected claims; and allows Claims 1-7, 10-15, 17-23, and 28-34. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Objection to Claim 15

The Examiner objects to Claim 15 as lacking antecedent basis for "FIR filter." Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's attention to detail. Applicants have corrected Claim 15 by changing "FIR filter" to "Taylor series approximation circuit," which has antecedent basis. This amendment is supported by, for example, Figure 8 and its accompanying description. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to Claim 15.

Double Patenting Rejection of Claim 16

The Examiner provisionally rejects Claim 16 under the judicially-created doctrine of double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 22 of co-pending Application No. 09/910,422. The undersigned is also the attorney of record for co-pending and related Application No. 09/910,422.

Without acquiescing to the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have canceled Claim 16 without prejudice herewith to speed issuance of the allowed and allowable claims. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 16 is now moot. Applicants further note that Claim 16 has been copied to related and co-pending Application No. 09/910,422.

Rejections of Claims 25, 26, 27, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejects Claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. In response, Applicants have amended Claims 26 and 27, and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of the same.

Appl. No. : 09/910,477
Filed : July 20, 2001

Claims 25 and 35 were rejected as being dependent on rejected Claims 26 and 27, respectively. In view of the patentability of amended Claims 26 and 27, Applicants have not rewritten Claim 25 or Claim 35 at this time.

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to Claim 15, the provisional double patenting rejection of Claim 16, and the rejections of Claims 25-27 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants further request the Examiner to allow Claims 1-7, 10-15, 17-23, and 25-35 and to pass the present application to the issue process.

If there is any further impediment to the prompt allowance of the present application, Applicants request the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney of record at 310-407-3466 or at the telephone number listed below to resolve any such impediment.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 12, 2006

By: Michael S. Okamoto
Michael S. Okamoto
Registration No. 47,831
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(310) 551-3450

2278258_1
011206